BURNS HAMPERED, HE TELLS COURT

On Stand at Hearing in the Frank Case to Explain His Work.

WITNESSES BAMBOOZLED

Admits Sending One Away to Prevent Police Interference— Denies He Paid for Affidavits.

BELIEVES CONLEY IS GUILTY

But Admits He Has No New Physical or Documentary Evidence as to the Murder.

Special to The New York Times.

ATLANTA, Ga., May 2.—For more than an hour to-day Detective W. J. Burns submitted to a rigid examination in regard to his connection with the case of Leo M. Frank by Solicitor Hugh Dorsey before Judge B. H. Hill.

The hearing on the extraordinary motion was not to have been resumed until Monday, but it was necessary for Mr. Burns to leave town for a few days, and the hearing was called for to-day.

Mr. Dorsey went into every phase of

which began more than a month ago. He inquired closely as to the terms of the contract which he had with his clients, and asked if it were not true that he would get a larger sum if Frank were liberated. Mr. Burns denied this.

Mr. Dorsey went fully into the circum-

stances which led to the signing of affidavits by the Rev. C. B. Ragsdale, R. L. Barber, and Annie Maude Carter, and indicated his suspicion that money had passed in all of these instances. He was unable, however, to show that Mr. Burns had taken any other than an innocent part in obtaining the affidavits.

He inquired as to Mr. Burns's ability

to teil that Frank was not morally deficient by a conversation of only a few hours, and as to his certainty that Conley was a degenerate of the worst type, when he had not seen the negro at all. Solicitor Dorsey was extremely per-

Solicitor Dorsey was extremely persistent in his efforts to get the detective to say what evidence he had unearthed not already made public, what he had accomplished, whom he had seen, and what new witnesses, if any, he had discovered.

"If you had no part in the Ragsdale

matter and did not turn up the Annie Maude Carter letters, will you please tell the court one thing that you have done in this investigation? You have been here sixty to ninety days. Mr. Burns, what have you been doing all this time?"

Mr Burns replied that he had gone

thoroughly over the briefs of evidence; that he had examined important witnesses; that he had visited the National Pencil Factory, and had visited the Solicitor in his office.

"And what was the result of all this work?" asked Mr. Dorsey.

"I made a report to my clients," said Mr. Burns, "in which I told them that they didn't need any evidence aside from that which was submitted at the first trial, that this showed beyond a doubt that Conley was the man guilty of the crime."

The solicitor brought out the fact that every bit of evidence which had been discovered by Mr. Burns or his agents was either now a part of the record or was in the hands of the attorneys for the defense.

The solicitor also learned that Mr. Burns had no further evidence, either physical, documentary, or in testimony. In answer to a question Mr. Burns stated that so far as he knew the defense had no witnesses whose testimony had not been injected into the case. Mr. Dorsey also got the admission that Mr. Burns had discovered no

Hampered, Says Burns.

By cross-examination, Attorney

proof of a crime committed by Conley.

By cross-examination, Attorney Reuben R. Arnold of the defense brought out the statement from the detective that he had been blocked and hampered in his work here in a surprising manner. On redirect examination Mr. Burns cited the Monteen Stover and the Conley incidents as "the most outrageous examples of the manner in which his work had been hampered." Judge Hill here interrupted with the remark:

"I am not going to allow this witness

to answer any question which reflects upon the verdict of the jury or the decision of the Supreme Court of Georgia." At one time Mr. Burns found himself in contempt of court when he admitted that he had advised attorneys for Frank to take a witness away from the city. In answer to a question he said he had suggested to counsel for Frank that they remove Anna Maude Carter to New Orleans to prevent complications in her connection with the newly discovered evidence. She is the colored woman who has made an affidavit to the effect that Conley confessed to murdering Mary Phagan. This witness is now in New Orleans.

Mr. Burns stated that he had advised her removal from Atlanta because of his fear that the police and detectives would get hold of her and distort her evidence by the kind of "frame-up" which he said, had been practiced by the detectives in the Frank case.

Solicitor Dorsey after coonferring with his assistant, Gen. E. A. Stephens, would not state whether he would institute contempt charges against either Mr. Burns or those members of Frank's

of the Carter woman.

Dan S. Lenon, a Burns agent, was subpoensed to appear before Judge Hill. But his examination was deferred until Monday.

Detective Burns was examined as fol-

:ewo

defense who had a hand in the removal

Q.—You are employed to investigate the murder of Mary Phagan, are you not? A.—

Q.—By whom? A.—I was first employed by Leonard and Herbert Haas.
Q.—Attorneys for Frank? A.—Yes.
Q.—You have been paid some money, and some more is still due you? A.—Yes.
Q.—Is this conditional on your finding? A.—No.
Q.—Is there a contract in writing for your

services? A.—Yes. A .- What is the difference in the event Frank is liberated through your efforts? A .- No difference. Q-You have seen Frank in the fail, and conferred with him frequently? A.-Yes. Q.-After you had talked with him a short time you were quoted in the papers as saying that he was not a pervert. Were you quoted correctly? A.-Yes. Q.-Do you profess to be able by talking to a man a short while to tell whether he is a pervert? A.-No, but I feel that by talking to him I can form a definite conclusion. Q.-How do you tell that a man is not a pervert? (Objection by Mr. Arnold overruled.) A.—I am somewhat of a student of human nature. As I work with criminal classes I frequently come in contact with them.

frequently come in contact with them.

Q.—You consider your opinion in the matter is trustworthy and accurate? A.—I do.

Q.—Did you have any conversation with Jim Conley before you came to the conclusion that he is a pervert? A.—No.

Q.—Then in his case you substituted a less trustworthy method! A.—After reading the letters that Conley wrote, and after examining the garments of Mary Phagan, I decided definitely that Conley is a pervert.

Q.—How do you know he wrote the let-

decided definitely that Conley is a pervert.

Q.—How do you know he wrote the letters. A.—I compared them with the so-called murder notes.

Not a Handwriting Expert.

Q.—Are you a handwriting expert, too! A.—No, but there are so many similar characteristics, there is no mistaking the letters. Q.—Mr. Burns. Mr. Smith. Conley's counsel gave you an opportunity to see Conley. Why did you not avail yourself of this privilege? A.—Because of the restrictions thrown around it.

Q.—Have you a man named Bob Adams in the employ of your agency? A.—I have a

man named Adams. I don't know whether his first name is Bob. Q.—Have you a man named W. W. Rogers, known as Boots Rogers! A.—Tes. Q.-Have you a man named Charles Isom? Q.-Did Charles Isom go to Chicago with you to assist you in your interview with the negro, Aaron Allen? A .- He did not. Q.—Didn't you have Allen in your charge for three days and bring Isom to Chicago to interview him? A.-No. Q.—Isom did come to Chicago to see Allen, didn't he? A.—Yes.
Q.—How did he happen to come there to see Allen? Who sent him? A.—I received a telegram from Herbert Haas, who said Isom was coming to Chicago and could get the truth out of Allen. Q.—Jake Jacobs was there to see Allen, too, wasn't he? A.—Yes. Q.—Have you got a man named O'Neal working for you? A.—Yes.
Q.—This man O'Neal went to Indianapolis after Allen and brought him back to you in Chicago while he was sick, didn't he, Mr. Burns? A.—I don't know anything about him having been sick, but he came to Chicago with O'Neal he came to Chicago with O'Neal. Q.-Hadn't you interviewed Allen two or three times before Isom came to Chicago, and hadn't you obtained an affi-davit from him? A.—Yes, I had talked to him two or three times and had obtained a statement from him. Q.-On the train returning from Chicago, Mr. Burns, didn't you state to Isom that you had got the affidavit you wanted from Allen? A.—No.
Q.—Didn't Isom report to you? A.—No. I asked him what he got from Allen. He told me nothing much; that he, Allen, had been placed in a cell with Newt Lee at Police Headquarters in Atlanta, and that Newt Lee had told him, Allen, that he, Newt Lee, was innocent, and that a white man had been put in a cell with Lee and had told Lee he had better keep his mouth shut or he would get us all in bad. Q.-Mr. Stiles Hopkins was in Chicago, wagn't he? A.-Yes; he took Allen's affi-Q.—What time was Jake Jacobs, the Decatur Street pawnbroker, there? A.-They were all there about the same time. Q.—Jake Jacobs is the man who swears to the character of Anna Maud Carter, isn't he? A.-I don't know. Q.-Mr. Burns, what did you say to Allen?

did not.
. Talk of a Stack of Money.

Didn't you curse and abuse him? A.-I

Q.-Mr. Burns, tell us about the stack of money left on the table in your main office while Allen was there and while the rest of you withdrew from the room. A .-No such thing happened. Q.-Did you pay Allen anything? A.-No. Q.—Didn't you authorize O'Neal to go to Indianapolis and tell Alien that you wanted nim to do some work for you in an effort to catch a negro? A.—No. Q .- What authority did you have for taking Allen to Chicago and detaining him there? A.-I never took him to Chicago, and I never detained him there. Q.-Do you deny that Isom was paid \$100 for his trip to Chicago? A.-I never paid him anything. Q.—Have you a man in your employ named Carlton C. Tedder? A.-I have not employed Q.—He is working for some of your agents, isn't he? A.-I think he has been employed Q.-You have conferred with Tedder, haven't you? A.—Yes. Q.-What sort of work did you have him doing? Working on the Conley case? A.-Q.-Didn't you just say you were employed to work on the Frank case? If so, why did you have Tedder working on the Conley case? A.-I was employed to work on both Q .- Why did you put Tedder on the Conley case? A.-I never employed Tedder. I don't know just what arrangements Lehon

Q.—Isn't Lehon one of your lleutenants, and doesn't he make his reports to you? A.—Lehon doesn't always report to me.

Q.—Lehon is in charge of your investigations while you are traveling about the country investigating other tangles, isn't he?

A.—Yes.

Q.—Doesn't he make written reports to you?

A.—Not always.

Q.—Then he reports verbally to you? A.—Some times

Q.—Eventually and ultimately, do you get all the reports from your men in every case?

A.—No.

Q.—Who does get the reports? A.—Mr.

Sears, the local manager, has charge of that; and our man Hause gets some of

Questioned About Trips.

Q.—Tell the court here why it is you have been making special trips, traveling all over the country, to Chicago, Kansas City, and other places investigating various angles of the case, though you were specially employed to direct the investigation here, and still you don't get all reports, either verbally or in writing. A.—I do not get them.

Q.—Are matters reported to Frank's counsel before they are reported to you? A.—No.

Q.—Don't you report everything to Frank's counsel? A.—No.

Q.—Who does? A.—Lehon and others.

Q.—Why do you report to the men?
A.—So they will know what is going on in the case.
Q.—When you conferred with Attorney Smith, Conley's lawyer, you know Tedder was reporting to Smith, didn't you? A.—Yes.
Q.—At that time didn't you ask Smith

Q.—At that time didn't you ask Smith if Tedder could be trusted implicitly? A.—Yes.
Q.—Why did you ask that question? A.—I wished to know if Tedder was trustworthy.

worthy.

Q.—Did you direct your activities toward the conviction of Conley and the demonstration of Frank as an imnocent man? A.—No, not if Conley was innocent. Q.—When did you first know of the Ragsdale matter? A.—Mr. Lehon first spoke to me about it.

Q.—What did he say? A.—He said there was a preacher who craimed to have been in an alley, and I stopped him right there.

Q.—Then you had been surfeited with that?

A.—I had

Q.—Who was the man in Chicago who claimed to have picked up a pockethook and a pencil in the alley? A.—I forget the man's name.

Q.—Didn't you take an affidavit from him?

A.—No.

Q.—Who did? A.—Mr. Hass, I think.

I didn't want to hear any more alley propo-

Q.—Is that affidavit in the city? A.—I think it is.

Q.—How many of these alley propositions did you hear of? A.—Three or four hundred. I think.

Q.—Did you find in Chicago a man who claimed to have been in the alley, and who claimed to have picked up a purse and a pencil and a memorandum? A.—I didn't find him.

Q.—Who are some of these three or four hundred people who claimed to have been in

the alley? A.—The operatives kept telling me of them.
Q.—Why, for instance? A.—Mr. Lehon and I were continually joking about the number of people who claimed to have been in the alley.
Q.—Did you dig up a man in Chicago? A.

Q.—Did you dig up a man in Chicago? A.—Yes.
Q.—Did you see the memorandum? A.—Yes, and I doubted that the memorandum was in Conley's handwriting.
Q.—Whose writing was it in? A.—I think it was in the man's own writing.
Q.—Is that the purse you spoke about? A.—I don't remember speaking about it.
Q.—Have you in your safe a purse that was claimed to have been found in the alley? A.—

Q.—You were credited with stories in the newspapers of Cleveland with saying that the guilty man in this case was at large? Is that report correct? A.—No. The newspapers have often misquoted me.

Q.—Tobic is your man in Chicago, isn't he? A.—Yes.

Q.—He was employed down here in this case, wasn't he? A.—I understand by hear-say that he was.

Q.—Who employed him? A.—I understand Tom Felder did.

O.—Who employed him? A.—I understand Tom Felder did.

Q.—Did Toble ever report on the case to you? A.—No.

Q.—Did you ever hear of what Toble found? A.—Only through the newspapers.

Q.—When did the Ragsdale matter first come to your attention? A.—A week or ten days before he made the affidavit.

Q.—Who else was present when Lehon brought it to your attention? A.—Possibly

Sears.

Q.—When did you next hear of it? A.—
Lehon came in and said the character of the preacher has been sustained—no, wait a minute. I did hear from Lehon before then that the preacher was corroborated, and I told him then I did not want to have anything to do with a man who had that much knowledge and withheld it so long. Lehon later came in and told me the man's character had been sustained. I told him I would have nothing to do with it, and advised him to take the matter to the attorneys and let them investigate it.

Q.—When was that? A.—Two or three days before the affidavit was made.
Q.—Did you ever talk with Arthur Thurman? A.—No.
Q.—Did you know that Messrs. Arnold and Rosser had talked about it? A.—I don't remember.
Q.—Do you know if any money was paid

Q.—Do you know if any money was paid to Ragsdale? A.—I do not.
Q.—To Barber? A.—I do not.
Q.—To C. C. Tedder? A.—No.
Q.—To Arthur Thurman? A.—No.
Q.—Would you have known, or would the money have been handled in such a way you

would not know? A.-If any of my men did such a thing he violated all the rules of the agency. Q.—You are more familiar with the Anna Maud Carter proposition than with the Ragsdale incident, are you not? A .- Yes. Q:-Then you are discoverer of that, are you not? A.-I wouldn't say that. Q.-Who deserves the credit for it? A.-I first saw her in the office of Attorney Haas. Q.-Did you ever come in contact with Jimmie Wrenn? A.-Yes; I saw two Wrenns. Q.—Where and how did you happen to meet them? A.-I saw them while they were working with Burke. Q.-Have you ever been to see Frank with Burke? A .- No never. Q.-Did you ever see Dr. George Wrenn in the tower? A.-No. Q.-What Burns man handled this Wrenn matter? A.-None that I know of.

Q.-When did you soo Wronn?

came to my office when I sent for him to get some one who was familiar with the letters.

Q.—Was that Dr. Wrenn? A.—I don't know. It was a man about 25 or 26 years old.

Q.—He is the man who furnished you with the translation of these letters? A.—He translated them for me, then Leonard Haas translated them.

Q.—When did you tell counsel for Frank about the notes? A.—Two of them, Messrs.

about the notes? A.—Two of them, Messrs. Leonard and Herbert Haas, were present when I got them.

Q.—How long before the first hearing of the extraordinary motion was that? A.—I don't know.

Q.—When war it? A.—Wrenn interpreted the notes only four or five days ago.

Q.—How long did you have them in your possession before they were interpreted? A.—Two or three days.

Q.—Who gave them to you? A.—C. W. Burke.

Q.—Then Burke deserves the credit for this? A.—Yes.

Q.—Tell us of one thing you have done in the—how long is it, sixty days—that you have been at work on this case? A.—Well. I have read the brief of evidence very carefully. I went over the factory, I interviewed the witnesses there, I came to your office and examined the garments of the dead girl, and I made a report to the attorneys that they didn't need any more evidence than was in the record.

Q.—There were over 100 State's witnesses, How many of them have you, examined? A.—I den't know.

Tells What He Did in Case.

I don't know.
Q.—Didn't you read the record? A.—I read the brief.
Q.—Name some of the witnesses you have examined. A.—Schiff, Darling, Lemmie, Quinn, Holloway, Frank himself—I don't remember the others.
Q.—Did you employ Booth Rogers to work for you in this case? A.—Yes.
Q.—Have you got him to change his testimony? A.—No.
Q.—Did you interview Monteen Stover? A.—I tried to.

Q.—Have you seen Newt Lee? A.—No. Q.-Did you talk with Starnes and Camp. bell? A.-No. Q.-Did you try to see the other witness, Lee? A.—No. Q.-Did you try twice to see Monteen Stover? A.-Yes. Q.—Tell us about the first time. A.—That was in the office of Attorney Boorstein. I told Leonard Haas I would like to talk to the Stover girl, but told him specifically I didn't want to talk to her without her permission of her parents. Later I told Boorstein the same thing. Later Haas phoned me that she and her parents were in Boorstein's office. I went immediately over there. As I reached the door Boorstein said, "Come in, Mr. Burns," and the girl jumped up and went out of the door with her mother after her. I told him to let her go, that I didn't want to speak to her if she didn't want to

talk to me.

Q.—Did you make arrangements with anybody to try to hold her? A.—No.

Q.—Did you have the stenographer try to catch her? A.—No. I did not.

Q.—Did you talk with Mr. Edmondson, her stepfather, then? A.—Yes.

Q.—Have you talked to Dr. Claud Smith, who examined the blood stains on the second floor? A.—No.

Q.—Have you talked to either of the doctors employed by the defense to make an examination of the blood there? A.—No.

Q.—Did you pay any attention to that phase of the case? A.—Why, of course, I did. I talked to the witnesses.

Q.—Did you talk to Mel Stanford? A.—No.

Q.—Did you talk to Mer Stamord' A.—No.
Q.—Did you talk to Barrett? A.—No.
Q.—Did Frank tell who was with him when he got down on his knees and examined the blood spots? A.—I have never heard of such an incident.
Q.—Did you talk to Lee? A.—No.
Q.—Did you ever examine the blood

spots found where Conley was sitting? A.-I talked with McWorth and Whitfield about them and they showed me where they were chipped up. Q.-Whitfield works for you, doesn't he? A.-I think he does. Q.-What became of these chips? A.-They were turned over to the Pinkertons and thrown away. I understand. Q.-Are you sure that they were chipped up? A.—Yes. Q.—You mean there on the first floor they were chipped up? A.—Yes. Q.—You understand, I don't mean the second floor. I mean the first floor. A.— That's what I mean. McWorth told me about finding the spots and showed me where they were chipped up. Q.-McWorth is now employed as assistant superintendent of your agency, is he not?

Q.—Did he tell you about the club? A.—Yes.
Q.—Have you seen it? A.—Yes.
Q.—Have you seen the blood stains on it?
A.—Yes.

Mr. Burns then explained that he was going to Oklahoma on business and was asked:
"When will you come back here?"

Q.—Fo handle all matters? A.—Yes-

"In about ten days."

Q.—Have you any evidence you have not reported to the attorney's for the defense?

A.—No.

Q.—When did you last report? A.—I have kept reporting developments daily.

Q.—When you were in my office you spoke of a final report. Have you made that? A.—Yes, but it is not in written form.

Q.—Will it be made public? A.—I have ad-

vised that it be not.

Witnesses Bamboozled.

Q.-Why? A.-It looks as if every time a witness is found he is bamboozled or turned about, and I have given it as my advice that as soon as a witness of importance is found he be sent out of town. Q.—Did you direct that course in the Carter case? A.—I suggested it. Q.-Who sent her out of town? A.-Mr. Lehon, I think. Q.—Where did he send her? A.—To New Orleans, said Burns, after objecting. Q.-After she made her affidavit in this case and became a witness, you mean to tell the court you advised and had her sent out of its jurisdiction? A .- Yes. I suggested and advised that she be sent away. Q.-At what place in New Orleans is she? A.-I don't know.

A.—I don't know.

Q.—Isn't she at 314 Lower Line? A.—I don't know.

Q.—Do you know anything about 314 Lower Line? A.—No.

Q.—Isn't she working for you or your agency there? A.—No.

Q.—Are you sure of that? A.—Yes.

Q.—Is she working for any of your agents or representatives? A.—No.
Q.—What did you pay Annie Maud Carter?
A.—Nothing.
Q.—Don't you know what, if anything, was paid her? A.—No.
Q.—Was any money given her by Dr. Wrenn for her notes and evidence? A.—I don't know.
Q.—Who handled the Carter woman last before you got hold of her? A.—The Messrs. Hass.

Q.—What was it you told the Carter wo-man's mother when she came to you about her daughter? A.—I told her I would arrange for her to go to see her daughter.

Q.—Did you do it? A.—No, she never came back.

Q.—Who attended to the details of getting Annic Carter out of town? A.—I don't know. Perhaps Mr. Lehon.

No More Evidence.

Q.—Mr. Burns, have you in your pessession or within your knowledge any evidence of a physical nature, not already before the court, tending to expose the murder of Mary Phagan? A.—No.

Q.—Have you any documentary evidence in your possession or within your knowledge not already before the court, tending to expose the murder of Mary Phagan? A.-No. Q .-- Mr. Burns, I want to put those questions a little differently. Have you, in your possession or within your knowledge, any physical evidence not already turned over to the lawyers for the defense which tends to expose the murder of Mary Phagan. A.-No Q.—Have you in your possession of within your knowledge any documentary evidence. not already turned over to the lawyers for the defense, that tends to expose the murderer of Mary Phagan? A.-No. Q.-Have you knowledge of any witnesses or other evidence tending to expose the inurderer of Mary Phagan, which you have not already turned over to the lawyers for the defense? A.-No. Q.-When did you make your full and detailed report to the lawyers for the defense? A.—I am reporting every day. Q .- When did you make your last report? A .- Probably a day or two ago. Q.—Be more specific. A.—I can't. I don't Q.—When did you talk last to the lawyers for the defense? A.—This morning. Q.-You talked to them last night and this morning? A.—Yes. Q.—Have you seen and read a copy of the defense's motion and amendments in this case? A.—No. Q.-Do you know of any evidence or issue not already in the hands of these men and already reported to the court? A.-No. Here Mr. Dorsey finished his crossexamination and Attorney Reuben R. Arnold for the defense began to question Mr. Burns. "Mr. Burns," began Mr. Arnold, "have you found it difficult on account

"Extremely so." Q.-Have you in all of your experience ever encountered more stubborn and un-reasoning prejudice? A.-I most certainly have not. Q.-Have you in all your experience ever found people so unwilling to tell even the simple truth? A.-I never have. Q.—Have you not found it difficult to hold a man's evidence after you have obtained it? A.-I have. Q.-Did you ever know of anything more outrageous than the Albert McKnight case? (Mf. Arnold was referring to the Frank witness who furnished an affidavit to the State recanting his repudiation of his trial testimony, while locked up in a cell at police station). A .- I have not. Q.—You read Albert McKnight's affidavit? Q .- You went to Albert McKnight after he gave the defense this affidavit? A.-Yes. Q.—What did he tell you? A.—He told me

the evidence he gave on the stand was un-

of the attitude of the public to make an

investigation in this case?"

true. That he had been induced to give this evidence by a man named Craven.
Q.—Did you read Jim Conley's evidence.
A.—Yes.
Q.—Have you ever heard of a court, jury, or community accepting such an explanation for such a crime? A.—I have not.

Says Conley is Guilty.

Q.—From your investigation, who do you think is guilty of the murder of Mary Phagen? A.—Unquestionably Jim Conley.

Attorney Arnold here asked Mr. Burns if he had read certain trial testimony relating to Conley changing his statements. The detective replied that he had.

Judge Hill then interrupted, telling At-

Judge Hill then interrupted, telling Attorney Arnold he would have to discontinue that line of questions.

"It seems to me, your honor," said Attorney Arnold, "that you are giving the solicitor a wider latitude in his questions than you are giving me."

"I won't permit you to ask questions which reflect on the jury's verdict or the ruling by the Supreme Court," replied Judge Hill. Attorney Arnold resumed his questioning of Burns.

Q.—Did you ever talk to Conley? A.—No. Q.—Where is he held? A.—He's kept locked

up in fail.
Q.—Is any one allowed to talk to him?
A.—No.—
Q.—Why didn't you embrace the privilege offered you by W. M. Smith, Conley's law-yer, to talk to him? A.—Because of Smith's terms.
Q.—What were those terms? A.—Why, Smith demanded that he be present and a reporter be there.
Q.—Under such circumstances could you get any information out of Conley? A.—I didn't think so.

didn't think so. Q .- You arrived at your conclusion that Conley was a pervert from the character of the letters he wrote to Annie Maude Carter, and the manner in which the dead girl's clothing was mutilated, didn't you? A.-Yes. Q.—What were the contents of those letters? A .-- Why, they were very vile. Q.—Mr. Burns, did you ever attempt to get anything in this case except the truth? Q.—Did you ever by the offer of bribes, intimidation or coercion or any other improper methods seek to obtain evidence from witnesses? A .- I assuredly did not. Q.—Were you besieged by people proffering absurd things as evidence? A.—Yes, by hundreds of them. Q.-And you found it difficult to estimate the motives actuating that? A.-I did. Solicitor Dorsey here took up a redirect examination of Detective Burns.

"Mr. Burns, what instances can you cite where obstacles were thrown in your way?" Mr. Dorsey asked,

"I consider the Jim Conley situation and the Monteen Stover situation as perfectly outrageous," replied Mr. Burns.

Q.—Why did you consider it outrageous for private individuals to refuse to submit to a cross-examination by four or five different men who were in the pay of a convict or his friends? A.—I supposed the object of every one was to bring out the real facts and to find the nurderer.

Q.—What caused you to change your sup-

Q.—What caused you to change your supposition? A.—The attitude of many persons, including some lawyers.
Q.—What lawyers do you refer to? A.—Why, you refused to discuss the case with me.
"After you told ma" quickly an-

"After you told me," quickly answered the Solicitor, "you thought Frank innocent, and after you told me you would report in a few days and that your report would state Frank was innocent and Conley was guilty.

"Yes," said Mr. Burns, "you told me if that was true, there was no use in discussing the case further."

"But you made an appointment with me," returned Mr. Dorsey. "You told me I could have the opportunity to convince you of Frank's guilt. I told you that you were attacking a verdict

of the court, and that if you wished I would give you an opportunity to convince me of Frank's innocence."

"The Solicitor's attitude led me to think he would not discuss the case with an open mind," Mr. Burns explained to the court.

Mr. Dorsey asked him to give other instances where he has been hampered in his investigation, and Mr. Burns re-

plied that he has been told by lawyers for the defense that certain witnesses were impossible to get at.

Q.—Who gave you such advice! A.—Both Mr. Leonard and Mr. Herbert Haas.

Q.—Did Mr. Arnold give you such advice? A.—Perhaps so.

Q.—Did Mr. Rosser give you such advice? A.—Maybe he did.

Q.—You say that many absurd matters were reported to you. Tell us the most

Q.—You say that many absurd matters were reported to you. Tell us the most ridiculous report made to you. A.—Why, all the men who have claimed that they were in the alley in the rear of the pencil factory on April 26, 1913, would make up a pretentious parade.

Q.—Did any one tell you that they had heard screams from the pencil factory? A.—No.

Q.—How about that Salvation Army man in Chicago? A.—I questioned him relative to the report that he had seen Conley in

Q.—Then you were directing your principal attention to Conley? A.—No.
Q.—You knew of Mary Rich's affidavit before you talked with the Salvation Army man? A.—Yes.
Q.—And you were endeavoring to corroborate her affidavit? A.—No; I simply sought to find out what truth there was in the report that the Salvation Army man had seen

Conley in the pencil factory alley.

Cites incidents of Bias.

Q.—Teil the court of any incidents on the part of thhe people showing prejudice. A.—I refer to the manner in which Albert Mc-Knight was handled and to numerous statements which I have read in the public orints.

Q.—Does that include Burke's effort to send McKnight out of town? A.—No.
Q.—Does it include Lehon's spiriting away of Anna Maude Carter? A.—No.
Q.—During your investigation what criminal act did you ever discover that Conley had committed? A.—I don't know that I have discovered any, except as to his general character.

"Come down, Mr. Burns," smilingly directed the Solicitor, and the detective left the stand. This concluded the examination, the Solicitor announcing that he would examine Lehon Monday morning.

Mr. Dorsey later said that next week he would take up the various ramifica-

tions of the Frank case with the Grand

Jury, which will be impaneled on Monday.

"I am going to put this whole matter before the Grand Jury—that is, if we nave time to reach it during the week," he added.

His men, he said, were looking for Jimmy Wrenn, who has been identified with C. W. Burke, one of the agents of the defense; for a man named Eubanks, said to be a Burns worker, and for a man named Lynn, chauffeur for Burke. Detective Burns said just before he left Atlanta this afternoon that the trouble he had with citizens of Marietta on Friday afternoon was one of the most outrageous affairs he had ever experienced. He called it a cowardly and unprovoked assault.

"I am surprised that such a thing

"I ain surprised that such a thing could have happened in this enlightened State," he continued. "I did not think that I should have been chased by a mob and insulted with the vilest of oaths.

"I was in Marietta with Mr. Lehon, attending to business. We left our automobile at the garage and started

attending to business. We left our automobile at the garage and started down the street, when a crowd began gathering. Just outside the doorway the man Howell rushed up to me, cursing, calling me vile names, and accusing me of being bought. Then the crowd came, and one of the men drew a knife and started toward me, but another grabbed him and told him to put his knife away. There were cries of 'lynch him,' 'get him,' 'kill him.'

"Lehon and I separated, and Lehon went to the Sheriff's office, while I

walked down the back streets and around for about an hour. Then I came out on the main street again, looking for Lehon, and found that crowds of men had been walking up and down and riding around in buggies looking for me. As I came out into the street four men passed me in a buggy and yelled: 'We'll get you, you —.' I walked on to the hotel and the crowd gathered there and was very boisterous, insulting, and unruly.

"I stayed in the hotel about an hour and a half, when Judge Morris and Deputy Sheriff Hicks came up and helped

uty Sheriff Hicks came up and helped me get out of town. It was a manifestation of the same spirit which denied Leo Frank a fair trial and forced his conviction for a crime which he did not commit."

ELECT CHAS. A. BOSTON.

Association of Medical Jurisprudence Selects Him for President.

The American Association of Medical Jurisprudence held its second appual

Jurisprudence held its second annual meeting yesterday at the New York Academy of Medicine and elected these officers for the coming year: President, Charles A. Boston: First Vice President, Oscar W. Ehrhorn: Second Vice President, Dr. D. Percy Hickling; Secretary, Charles P. Blaney, and Treasurer, John C. West. At a scientific session in the afternoon papers were read by Charles A. Boston, Dr. A. Ernest Gallant, Oscar W. Ehrhorn, Dr. Frank W. Robertson, John S. Durand, Theodore Sutro, and Dr. Louis F. Bishop. In the evening a dinner was tendered to the out-of-town members of the association and their guests by the resident members. Twenty-two were present at the feast, which was held at the Café des Beaux Arts.

Metropolitan Life's War Rates.

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Com-

pany notified its agents throughout the country yesterday that war risks would be written at the regular rates and for full benefits in case of death. Announcement was also made that full benefits would be paid on all policies which had been taken out, despite the restrictive clause in the policies. The only limitation in the cases of those who may hereafter apply for insurance is that the beneficiary must be a bona fide dependent, and that the maximum amount be \$2,000.

Copyright © The New York Times